

From: Bill Brown [mailto:bill@cbpac.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 10:37 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA - North Central Coast Siting

To Whom It May Concern:

When I was just a boy, my father drove his three young sons from the city out to the Coast at Stewarts Point. Stopping at the Stewarts Point Store, he had the pleasure of introducing us to rock fishing from the shore of the Richardson lands, with Bus Richardson providing access. It was fantastic rock cod fishing, which was the highlight of my boyhood fishing memories.

I've been an avid fisherman and abalone diver all my adult life and have been one of 2,000 owners of The Sea Ranch for 21 years. Now I live here, and work in Gualala, and see firsthand the interdependence of local resources, employers, tourism, renters, fisheries, and many more factors in the economic lifeblood of these communities on the North Coast.

From that perspective, I urge you to adopt Proposal 2XA as the MPA for this region. It is the best balancing of competing variables, and will provide the best outcomes for the MLPA goals, and be the most "livable" alternative for the people who raise their families here, make their living here, and visit this coastline for recreation and sustenance. And it will have the least negative impact on the economic well-being of the Coast because it provides the greatest amount of coastline for open use.

Thank you for your consideration,

Bill Brown

From: CE Brown [mailto:cebrown@mcn.org]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 10:34 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA - North Central Coast Siting

I'm a 20-year owner at The Sea Ranch and am delighted to be a part of the stewardship of the natural treasures along this beautiful North Coast.

I haven't been able to attend the public process meetings of the MLPA groups, but I've been following it on the Fish & Game website, and thank you for providing recordings of the meetings on-line, which are wonderfully useful.

As your final three proposals go forward to the Blue Ribbon Task Force, please consider my strong support of Proposal 2-XA. Of the three alternatives, this one provides the greatest amount of seashore for local stewardship and use, while meeting all of the requirements of the MLPA in the North Central Coast region. It's a solid proposal designed to provide the best compromise solutions for all.

Many thanks for your discussions which have recognized the special nature of the Del Mar Point marine preserve, which has been vigorously protected by The Sea Ranch community for decades, providing a heritage seal rookery which is dear to the hearts of many, and an important birthing area for local seal populations. Please make sure that the Del Mar Point continues to be protected.

Sincerely, CE Brown

From: Scott Tibbedeaux [mailto:raven@the-ravens.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 9:43 PM

To: MLPAComments
Subject: proposal 2-xa

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a fisherman in the state of California, I hold a lifetime license and prior to getting my lifetime license I have purchased a license every year from the time I was 16 until I turned 32. My father was is a fisherman, and his father before him was a fisherman as well. I have a six year old son who is just starting to lear and enjoy fishing. And it is for him that I am writing this letter. I am all for the MPLA process because without it there may not be anything left for my son to fish for. However one thing has very much concerned me in this process. Most of the protected areas are in the locations near ports. Everybody does not have a boat that will allow you to make a 20 mile round trip. Both proposals 1-3 and 4 put fisherman who can not afford a large boat to have to choose between putting themselves and their passengers in harms way or not to fish at all. This is wrong as a direct result of how this is be done you are making fishing a rich mans sport when it is the right of each and every California as stated in our state constitution. Proposal 2-XA is a fair and just compromise between protecting our resources and deterring people from being able to exercise their rights to fish. Please keep this in mind while making your final decision.

From: Matthew Plut [mailto:sw44magnum@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 9:33 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please Support Proposal 2-XA for the NCC MPA

I am a recreational fisherman and a member of Coastside Fishing Club.

I am writing to urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish and Game Commission to support **Proposal 2-XA**. This process will affect a significant portion of the coast and have a huge economic impact. The livelihoods of commercial fishermen, bait and tackle shops, harbors, travel lodges boat and trailer dealers, service centers associated with boat, trailer and automotive repair, are just some of the industries which will be affected by the implementation of the NCC MPA's.

The impacts of **Proposal 2-XA**, while substantial, will still allow businesses to survive with their implementation. Once again, I strongly urge you to support **Proposal 2-XA**.

Respectfully, Matthew S. Plut

From: Richard Corazon de Leon [mailto:lionheart.richard@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 4:30 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please support Option 2AX

From: Richard Kent [mailto:d1m@technologist.com]
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I support MLPA proposal 2AX

I am retired individual that has one great joy that being fishing off the coast of Northern California. With the closing of salmon fishing and pending closing of most of the decent and easily accessible bottom fishing areas I, and all those that live to fish, will have nothing to look forward to for the remainder of our lives. The result of this closure will result in the severe reduction of quality of life for myself and all other fisherman. No longer will I be able to take my grand children out for a day of togetherness and fishing. No longer will our children and grand children know the joys of the sea and what it takes to manage the resource that is so valuable. No longer will our children learn that the fish that they love to eat does not come in a plastic wrapped package in our supermarkets.

Any reasonable person that does not want this bleak image of our children's future come true must vote for option 2AX

Richard Kent

From: Joe Bishop [<mailto:bishop@mac.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 4:05 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA options

I want to implore you to vote for option 2AX under the MPLA options.
This is the only reasonable option available that a rational person could select.

From: Mike Giraudo [<mailto:mike@intecsolutions.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 4:01 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

I support 2-XA. It has the best balance of conservation and citizen access.

Mike Giraudo, Pacifica, Ca

From: Todd Frediani [<mailto:toddfrediani@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 3:30 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Letter in support of Proposal 2XA

Please read the following enclosed letter that I have carefully written in support of Proposal 2XA.
Thanks,
Todd Frediani

March 23, 2008

To whom it may concern:

I am writing this letter to summarize my deep concerns involving the upcoming MLPA decision and recommending that you support **"Proposal 2XA"**.

"Proposal 2XA" meets the necessary requirements as outlined in the policies of the MLPA. **"Proposal 2XA"** was crafted by people that understand the north coast, its thriving ecosystems and local economy. It will remove the least amount of seashore from public consumptive use and provide the most amount of collaborative benefit to all parties involved. The key takeaways of **"Proposal 2XA"**:

- **2XA meets all the requirements of the MLPA guidelines.**
- **2XA protects the environment and takes the least amount of coastline.**
- **2XA is fully endorsed by the Sea Ranch Association.**
- **2XA is a collaborative solution created by individuals that understand the north coast environment and economy.**
- **2XA designates "natural marine environments" allowing individuals to observe and enjoy marine life in its natural and undisturbed state.**
- **The proposal is fair to both public and private lands demonstrating an "equal burden" throughout the total "North Central Coast Study Region".**

Most importantly, it is endorsed by many local residents and business owners as it is very sensitive to the environment, landowners and commercial industry.

The final decision to be made in this process is a very important one. I ask that you consider **"Proposal 2XA"** to be the model for which the North Coast MLPA is based.

Thank you,
Todd Frediani

From: Lynn Pomeroy [mailto:lpomeroy@pacbell.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 1:35 PM
To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Subject: Richardson Property

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this note to support Proposal 2XA of the MLPA process. It would be totally superfluous and expensive to close the Richardson land to fishing, diving, and tidepooling. It would be an unnecessary closure because the marine wildlife there is a living museum which has been well-preserved and utilized wisely thanks to the stewardship of 2 generations of the Richardson family. If areas must be closed, it would be far better to close other areas that have been over-used and over-harvested by virtue of public access over the years.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lynn Pomeroy, Davis, California

From: Stan Gollinger [mailto:teal@ifn.net]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 8:34 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA implementation

To Whom it may concern,

I would like to lend my voice in support of PROPOSAL 2XA as a means of implementing the MLPA *Marine Life Protection Act*. After studying the various proposals and options for implementation of MLPA it is clear to me that PROPOSAL 2XA is the most workable and practical solution. PROPOSAL 2XA meets ALL of the guidelines of the MLPA, and is the least expensive to enact and enforce. PROPOSAL 2XA is endorsed by the Sea Ranch Association and all of the landowners involved. PROPOSAL 2XA closes the least amount of coastline and is fair to all concerned.

Protecting our marine resources is very important and something we should all aspire to. However in doing so we should take into account the rights of all property owners. PROPOSAL 2XA does just that. I urge you to please adopt PROPOSAL 2XA as a means of implementing the MLPA.

Thank you,
Stan Gollinger

From: Richard Navarro [mailto:rnavarroelectric@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 23, 2008 8:25 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: fishing with dad

My name is Hayley Navarro. I am eight years old. I love to go fishing with my dad and my 4 year old brother on the bay and the Ocean. We catch Salmon, Rockfish and sharks. I Love to show my friends and teacher pictures of our fishing trips. My dad said that we need to vote in Proposal 2-XA to have fishing on the ocean still available to us. Please help us for our fishing future.

Thank you very much,
Haley Navarro

From: phil gaines [mailto:philipjgaines@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 9:36 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: fgc@fgc.ca.gov

Subject: Support for Proposal 2XA

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this note to support Proposal 2XA of the MLPA process. The coast around Stewart's Point has been well maintained and preserved without any interference. If areas must be closed then please choose areas that have been overused and overfished of which there are many.

Sincerely

Philip Gaines

From: Michael Henry Thornhill [<mailto:mthornhi@ucsc.edu>]

Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 8:40 PM

To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov

Subject: endorsement of proposal 2XA

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this note to support Proposal 2XA of the MLPA process. It would be totally superfluous and expensive to close private land to fishing, diving, and tidepooling. It would be an unnecessary closure because the marine wildlife there is a living museum which has been well-preserved and utilized wisely thanks to the stewardship of 2 generations. If areas must be closed, it would be far better to close other areas that have been over-used and over-harvested by virtue of public access over the years.

Thank you for your consideration,
Mike Thornhill

From: Dan Waddell [<mailto:dan@fullspeedfishing.com>]

Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 6:56 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: adopt option 2AX.

Board,

Please adopt option 2AX.

Dan Waddell and Family.

From: Henry Spoto [<mailto:hspototo@yolo.com>]

Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 6:10 PM

To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov

Subject:

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this note to support Proposal 2XA of the MLPA process. It would be totally superfluous and expensive to close private land to fishing, diving and tidepooling. It would be an unnecessary closure because the marine wildlife there is a living museum which has been well-preserved and utilized wisely thanks to the stewardship of 2 generations of families. If areas must be closed, it would be far better to close other areas that have been over-used and over-harvested by virtue of public access over the years.

Thank you for your consideration.

Henry Spoto, Jr.

From: Elizabeth Ross [<mailto:rfam@astound.net>]

Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 5:56 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2XA

Please support proposal 2XA for the MLPA. It's only fair for the fisherman.
Thank You,
Rick Ross

From: The Lee's [mailto:dddwmlee@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 4:18 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Favor of 2Xa proposal

Dear BRTF and MLPA Commission,

This letter is in response to your consideration of the three proposals forwarded to the BRTF. I strongly urge you to support the 2-XA proposal as it creates the best opportunity for conservation of resources and recreational fishing.

I and my family have been fishing in the waters around the Golden Gate for decades and I remember my Dad taking me to the area around Duxbury and Point Reyes for salmon and rockfish, but mostly salmon. Likewise I have taken my 3 kids out since they were toddlers, not even able to fish. But as soon as they were able, they couldn't wait to get a rod in their hands. I am proud to say all 3 still enjoy our ocean fishing with me. I know they will be taking their kids out same as I did, it's in our blood. And it's not just the fishing, although that is what lures us back to the Pacific, it's the numerous sunrises and sunsets, the wild water conditions and the flat calm days, it's the boating and the sense of adventure every trip provides. If we are excluded from fishing in large areas of the coast these opportunities will end for us. Our quality of life will change.

This is why I ask you to support proposal 2-XA, to ensure that lifelong fishing opportunities are maintained without unnecessary exclusions from fishing. Although I feel that most of the fishing stocks and habitat can and is being adequately protected by our current Fish & Game management efforts I understand that the law dictates that these areas be established.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
David Lee

From: Tina Thornhill [mailto:tinathornhill@berkeley.edu]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 3:15 PM
To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Subject: In Support of Proposal 2XA

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this note to support Proposal 2XA of the MLPA process. It would be totally superfluous and expensive to close private lands to fishing, diving, and tidepooling. It would be an unnecessary closure because the marine wildlife there is a living museum which has been well-preserved and utilized wisely thanks to the stewardship of 2 generations. If areas must be closed, it would be

far better to close other areas that have been over-used and over-harvested by virtue of public access over the years.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kristina Thornhill

From: Scott Sullivan [mailto:scott@agseeds.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 2:43 PM
To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Subject: Richardson Property- Proposal 2XA

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter in support of Proposal 2XA of the MLPA process. I am a third generation native Californian, and come from a family of conservation minded outdoor enthusiasts that have enjoyed California's natural resources for many years. I am an avid free and scuba diver and have been diving in Northern California waters from Fort Bragg to Monterey for over 30 years. The water off the Richardson property contains a pristine habitat for a wide range of marine life and has been well preserved by the Richardson family. Closing this area to fishing, diving, tide pooling etc would not enhance the area in any way nor would it serve the long term environmental interests of the citizens of California. Please focus your closure efforts on coastal areas that have been depleted by years of public access and over fishing.

Respectfully Submitted by

Scott R. Sullivan

From: Elizabeth Ross [mailto:rfam@astound.net]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 12:16 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA

I have grown up fishing in California and as of the last 6 or 7 years have seen a relentless attack against the salt water fisherman. I am 52 and this is my only hobby. Every year we loose some of our fishing area or species and now with the salmon collapse and the threatened closure of the MPA's I find it hard to buy a fishing license for a very short season. Our goal (10 partners) is to move our adventures and boats to British Columbia where we can justify our expenses of renting a slip, spending thousands on fuel, bait, tackle and the like. Please support prop 2 of the MLPA in the never ending battle against the recreational fisherman.

With great dispare,
Richard D. Ross

From: James Erdman [mailto:jmerdman@citlink.net]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 10:04 AM
To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Subject: Proposal 2 XA

To Whom It May Concern:

We want to voice our support for Proposal 2 XA that allows for preserving our natural coastal marine habitat and also allows for private ownership of our beautiful California Coast. We are owners on The Sea Ranch, which also supports this proposal. We know this proposal has been well thought out and takes into consideration all the aspects of establishing and preserving the marine animal life along our coast. Thank you for your time in listening to our request. Sincerely,
Jim and Marilyn Erdman

From: matthew bates [mailto:mmbates1@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 9:33 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Proposal 2 XA

I am an avid fisherman and diver. I use the california coastline year round for fishing and diving. I started free diving for abalone when i was 9 years old. Over the years i have enjoyed this time with my family and friends. I feel enforcing the laws that stand would improve our resources better than creating more closed areas. I also feel that more focus should be placed on pollution that is drained into our oceans. Since the MLPA's are mandatory i would support proposal 2 XA.

Thank you
Matthew Bates

From: Todd Brandt [mailto:todd@brandtinsurance.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 9:21 AM
To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Subject: Proposal 2XA

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this note to support Proposal 2XA of the MLPA process. It would be totally superfluous and expensive to close the Richardson land to fishing, diving, and tidepooling. It would be an unnecessary closure because the marine wildlife there is a living museum which has been well-preserved and utilized wisely thanks to the stewardship of 2 generations of the Richardson family. If areas must be closed, it would be far better to close other areas that have been over-used and over-harvested by virtue of public access over the years.

Thank you,

Todd F. Brandt
Healdsburg, CA

From: Jim Volberding [mailto:jamiv925@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 8:58 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: My letter in support of Proposal 2-XA

Hello,

I'm a recreational fisherman and a member of the Coastside Fishing club.

I have a Love and Passion for fishing and the outdoors. I've been an avid fisherman and outdoorsman since I was old enough to hold and cast a fishing rod. That's some 50 plus years.

I'm writing to encourage members of the BRTF and the Fish and Game Comission to support Proposal 2-XA. It is the least restrictive of the three proposals and exceeds the levels of protection criteria by setting a "High Level of Protection". It also meets the size and spacing requirements set forth in the MLPA process. Proposal 1-3 is still incomplete and includes 22 percent of the North Central coast. Proposal 4 is entirely to restrictive and takes 27 percent of the coast.

I don't particularly like any of the proposals that restrict fishing but, Proposal 2-XA is the better of the three proposals. It allows for safety for small boat access. It is scientifically based and took Socio Economic impacts seriously for this part of the MLPA process. I therefore Strongly urge the BRTF and the Fish and Game Comission to adopt Proposal 2-XA. I want my grandsons to have areas that available and provide good fishing in the future

in our area. Closing off portions off the coast for just viewing purposes and making it parts of an aquarium isn't part of my interest.

Once again Please adpot proposal 2-XA and use it as a model for future MLPA zones.

Thank You,
James Volberding
Pittsburg, Ca

From: maiertim@comcast.net [<mailto:maiertim@comcast.net>]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 8:44 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support MLPA #2

I retired three years ago and recreational ocean fishing for salmon, rock cod and crab has become one of my passions. I and my friends finally have the time to enjoy one of California's great natural resources, as well as help to support and enjoy local restaurants, tackle shops, party boats and other small businesses. While I support the stated purpose of the MLPA to protect our marine life, I sincerely hope that all interested parties are considered equally in the final recommendation and the preferred alternative is based upon the best available science.

Of the three proposals remaining in the process, I strongly recommend you consider MLPA proposal #2, as it balances the interests of all Californians - socio-econonically, environmentally and an initiative I would be proud to pass on to my son.

Thanks for your consideration.

Tim Maier
3 Bassett Lane
Atherton, CA 94027

From: Dave Porter [<mailto:daveporter87@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2008 8:36 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: our water our fish

Dear Sir,

Please understand that I'm an active conservationist, and avid fisherman. I just want you consider proposal 2 so that I can continue to enjoy the beautiful waters of California. I know we need to limit our fishing activities, but also be realistic to the fisherman.

Sincerely,

Dave Porter

Dave Porter
www.daveporter.com

From: nexform@sbcglobal.net [<mailto:nexform@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 11:17 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Proposal 2 XA

I am writing to urge the members of BRTF and the Fish and Game Commision to adopt Proposal 2-XA.

I am an avid fisherman and hope that my two sons will have chance to learn and enjoy this hobby in the future. It is important that we conserve our resources but we need to strike a balance.

I believe fishermen most appreciate and care for our waters and resources. There are many reasons for this but the paramount reason is that we enjoy cooking and eating our catch. I am often surprised to find that many people have never had a fresh fish and find that they are very indifferent about the issues that exist in our oceans and environment. I have tried to introduce as many people as possible to the taste of fresh seafood so that they will understand; want to learn more and ultimately take more active roles to protect our marine environment and resources.

While this view may be counter-intuitive, I believe that to get people to care and take more active role to protect our environment and resources, we need better access and education rather than more restrictions. We need more people to care about the water quality, health of the fish stock and overall environment and that is the reason why I support Proposal 2-XA.

Sincerely,

Darren Kim

From: Matthew Plut [mailto:sw44magnum@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 10:39 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please Support Proposal 2-XA for the NCC MPA

I am a recreational fisherman and a member of Coastside Fishing Club.

I am writing to urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish and Game Commission to support **Proposal 2-XA**. Although **Proposal 2-XA** is much more restrictive to fishing than I would like to see, I find it to be the best compromise between all users. The impacts of **Proposal 2-XA**, while substantial, are not outright oppressive as are the other proposals. Once again, I strongly urge you to support **Proposal 2-XA**.

Respectfully,

Matthew S. Plut

From: Greg Pourroy [mailto:GPourroy@valleywater.org]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 9:11 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Proposal 2 XA

I am a member of Coastside fishing club I would strongly urge you to support **MLPA Proposal 2 XA**. I spend thousands of dollars each year on boats supplies, fishing equipment and fishing licenses and each year the BRTF and Fish and Game Commission takes something away from me as a fishermen. The ability to fish! This is got to stop! I do not like any to the three proposals, but if there has to be a choice, then **MLPA Proposal 2 XA** is the least restrictive of the three proposals. Even this proposal will hurt people in the fishing and retail community. As we go forward into this year, your choice will affect many people who work in the fishing and boating industry! Please choose wisely so these people can still make a living.

Thank You
Greg Pourroy

PS This is not a form letter!!!

From: Kelly Richardson [mailto:ksuzr@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 7:32 PM
To: Steve McLaughlin; Archer Richardson; MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov; Cindy Greer
Subject: Letter Re: MLPA

March 21, 2008

To whom it may concern:

As the MLPA North Coast process is winding down, it is very important that extra consideration is taken when selecting the final proposal. The impact of this decision will affect many people and families. None of us are quite sure of what exactly this impact will be.

I have attended many meetings and viewed the meetings that I have missed via the video link on the Fish and Game Website. The process has been frustrating, but nonetheless very educating. After reviewing the three proposals that remain, I would like to offer my support to **"Proposal 2XA"**.

"Proposal 2XA" meets the necessary requirements as outlined in the policies of the MLPA. In addition to meeting those requirements; out of the three remaining proposals **"Proposal 2XA"** removes the least amount of seashore from public consumptive use. It is an excellent proposal, which was very well prepared by people that are very knowledgeable and intimate with the local economy and ecosystems, in addition to spending a lot of time utilizing our local waters.

"Proposal 2XA" provides an equal burden of the protected areas on both public and private lands. It is endorsed by many local residents and business owners as it is very sensitive to the environment, adjacent landowners, and the local commercial industry.

"Proposal 2XA" will preserve two of the eight public access points at The Sea Ranch, and the other two proposals do not mention any enhancement or benefit to The Sea Ranch image. This aligns **"Proposal 2XA"** with the values of the residents of The Sea Ranch, which is to "walk softly on the land".

The final decision to be made in this process is a very important one. I ask that you consider **"Proposal 2XA"** to be the model for which the North Coast MLPA is based. I encourage others to endorse this proposal as well.

Thank you,
Kelly Richardson

From: Tony Koregelos [mailto:ihookem@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 7:02 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: In Favor of MLPA Proposal #2XA

To whom it may concern,

I have been fishing norether California for over 35 years or as long as I can remember. And as i sit here trying to think of what words to describe the situation I am put in, I am almost paralyzed by the fact that most of our fishery will be closed this coming year. Is this just a bad dream or a completely poor job by or governing bodies. Well I have to say both. I would hope that the decision maker will strongly look at MLPA Proposal #2XA, for it is only viable option to giving the recreational fisherman a chance to carry on our way of life. I would also recommend that better decisions be made in the future on our resource. Shutting down the Ocean is not an option for the mismanagement of our fisheries.

Sincerely
Anthony James Koregelos

From: Kathy Thornhill [mailto:KathyThornhill@cal.net]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 5:59 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: support for proposa l2XA

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this note to support Proposal 2XA of the MLPA process. It would be totally superfluous and expensive to close the Richardson land to fishing, diving, and tidepooling. It would be an unnecessary closure because the marine wildlife there is a living museum which has been well-preserved and utilized wisely thanks to the stewardship of 2 generations of the Richardson family. If areas must be closed, it would be far better to close other areas that have been over-used and over-harvested by virtue of public access over the years.

Thank you for your consideration,
Kathy Thornhill

From: Robert Grissom [mailto:rgrissom1@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 5:22 PM
To: MLPAComments

I strongly support Proposal 2-XA as scientifically sound and the best balance between marine reserves and a "High" level of protection in the "Preferred" size range in keeping with the charge from the BRTF.

Proposal 2-XA is also to be commended for surpassing the goals of the MLPA while minimizing adverse economic, recreational, and enforcement effects.

On a more personal note, Proposal 2-XA will enable mothers and fathers to share the healthy joys of fishing with their children in their small boats in safer waters. There is great joy and bonding when a child proudly catches a fish and later shares it with the family at dinnertime.

Sincerely,
Robert J. Grissom, Ph.D.

From: Mark Davis [mailto:mdavis@themarketechgroup.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 4:11 PM
To: MLPAComments; fgca@fgc.ca.gov
Subject:

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this note to support Proposal 2XA of the MLPA process. It would be totally superfluous and expensive to close the Richardson land to fishing, diving, and tide pooling. It would be an unnecessary closure because the marine wildlife there is a living museum which has been well-preserved and utilized wisely thanks to the stewardship of 2 generations of the Richardson family. If areas must be closed, it would be far better to close other areas that have been over-used and over-harvested by virtue of public access over the years.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mark

Mark Davis, MBA
Managing Partner
The MarkeTech Group, LLC

From: Henry Thornhill [mailto:Henry.Thornhill@HazardCanyon.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 3:02 PM
To: MLPAComments; fgca@fgc.ca.gov
Subject: Endorsing Proposal 2XA

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this note to support Proposal 2XA of the MLPA process. It would be totally superfluous and expensive to close the Richardson land to fishing, diving, and tidepooling. It would be an unnecessary closure because the marine wildlife there is a living museum which has been well-preserved and utilized wisely thanks to the stewardship of 2 generations of the Richardson family. If areas must be closed, it would be far better to close other areas that have been over-used and over-harvested by virtue of public access over the years.

Thank you for your consideration,
Henry Thornhill

From: Rich Abazia [mailto:rich@cypressfinancial.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 1:33 PM
To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Cc: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Subject: Support propasal 2XA

To whom it may concern: As a resident, citizen, and sportsman of Sonoma County for over 30 years I support Proposal 2XA. I encourage you to pass and support this proposal.

Rich Abazia
Cypress Financial Mortgage

From: S. David Rosenthal [mailto:sdr@demasandrosenthal.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 1:08 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA - Proposal 2-XA

Dear BRTF & DFG,

Re: **MLPA Process**

I'm a tax paying citizen born and raised in California. My hobby is salt water fishing and it is one of the greatest joys in my life. So much so that I spend thousands of dollars a year on fishing licenses, boat services and products, a marina slip, fuel, bait, tackle, and other miscellaneous items associated with my fishing activity. I'm a member of the Coastside Fishing Club, and have other family and friends, all California taxpayers, who also participate in my fishing endeavors.

One of the most exciting aspects of salt water fishing is the close connection between the participants and the ocean, a truly wild and natural environment. As a fisherman, I want to preserve the ocean habitat and its resources both for its own sake and for the use and enjoyment of all Californians. In my experience, fisherman are some of the staunchest protectors of the ocean.

That's why I'm asking you to vote for proposal 2-XA. This is the only ocean management plan that truly balances fishing access and an approach to conservation that makes sense based on the available scientific information. Recreational fishing is good for California. Please choose a plan that benefits both the ocean and those that use it the most.

David Rosenthal
DEMAS & ROSENTHAL, LLP

From: Nate Greenaway [mailto:nate.greenaway@walshwireless.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 12:59 PM

To: MLPAComments
Subject: option 2AX

Please adopt option 2AX and save our small fish towns and keep private boaters out on the water.

NATE GREENAWAY
Walsh Wireless Solutions, LLC

From: Michael LaROcco [mailto:mlarocco@pacbell.net]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 10:53 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support proposal 2-XA

This letter is to all who have worked and toiled so very hard to make the dream of a sustainable fishery for our future a reality. The Issue of Marine Reserves is a complex and sometimes a divisive one. All I ask for in this letter is that we don't lose sight of the vision of our children and grand childrens enjoyment of Californias great ocean resources. I have been Ocean fishing in California for well over 20 years, My son, who is 15 years old now, practically grew out of his diapers on my boat. I have seen the declines, and there are many factors, and it wouldn't hurt to protect some areas, and monitor their conditions. Proposal 2-XA is my choice, and should be the choice of the Fish and Game commission, and The BRTF. It will ensure that our fisheries stay healthy, and future generations of Californians will enjoy all that our Ocean resources have to offer. We can't afford to drive those away who would pay the bulk of the monitoring and enforcement of these areas. Who will pay? The Taxpayer? Teachers and school children are marching on the Capitol over State budget cuts. The best strategy for the MLPAI was to keep consumptive users of the resource involved, which you seem to have accomplished with this process. I certainly hope you keep consumptive users engaged and involved with the adoption of Proposal 2-XA

Sincerely, Mike LaRocco

From: Vic Giacalone [mailto:vicg@besteleco.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 10:46 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Salmon Fishing

To whom it may concern;
I am a life-long resident of California. I live and work in San Jose; and own a boat, which is berthed in Santa Cruz. I have been fishing in the ocean, since I was a child in the 50's. My wife, my four children, my two grandkids and countless friends fish with me often in Monterey Bay.
There is no doubt that the precipitous decline in the population of salmon returning to spawn in the Sacramento River Delta is alarming. I applaud the decisions to revise the decision to open the recreational season in April. However, I do not feel that it would be logical nor fiscally logical to take draconian measures. There simply is just too much at stake financially for this approach to make sense.
I would hope that you would consider the MLPA Proposal 2 XA to be the best way to alleviate the pain somewhat for the fishing industry, while allowing the salmon populations to recuperate.
Thank you.

Vic Giacalone
Best Electrical Co., Inc.

From: Vince Pasquini [mailto:vpasquini@Devcon-const.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 9:23 AM
To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Subject: Pro Proposal 2XA

To Whom it may Concern,

Please allow this note to go on record of my support for Proposal 2XA.

Not that I agree with everything this measure is for, it seems to be the only reasonable option. Though a State Marine Preserve sounds good on paper, it does not when one realizes that it will inhibit use to the majority of those who enjoy the land. As a proud member of this fine state, I do not appreciate it when I am blindsided by measures that take away my freedom to enjoy it's land.

I have been fishing and diving on this coastline for years. Always abiding by the laws and regulations and not having an issue with them, as I know they are for the common good. They are set in place to regulate those who feel they need to selfishly take advantage of them.

Pushing for measures that inhibit use of this land implies to me that control of the previously established laws has been lost; that poachers run free. I would much rather that the wrong actions of the few (law breaking poachers) are not served as consequences to the many (law abiding citizens). Rather than punish everyone, I would prefer that efforts were focused on the law breakers to ensure that they follow the same size, limit, etc. rules that the remaining citizens follow.

In summary, if a proposal must be chosen, let it be Proposal 2XA. I would like to go on record though that Proposal 2XA, 5, and 13 are all infringements on my state rights. As a tax paying citizen, I would prefer that my dollars and time were not wasted in such a fashion for proposals like this to even be discussed.

Sincerely,

Vincent Pasquini

From: Scott Hibbard [mailto:hibbards@HDCCO.com]

Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 9:22 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Support of proposal 2XA

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to support proposal 2XA, to keep the family heritage alive at land and beaches in generations of Richardson stewardship. They should not become State Marine Reserves, the generations of family blood need to keep protecting these lands as they have done for a many years which has proven time and again more effective then any state operation.

Scott Hibbard

From: John Berry [mailto:johnfberry@msn.com]

Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 8:36 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: MLPA Proposal 2 XA

March 21, 2008

Some of my most memorable experiences over the past 50 years have been fishing in the ocean waters between Fort Bragg and Santa Barbara. Thanks to a successful salmon fishing outing at Duxbury with my father-in-law I gained his approval to marry his daughter! We have been married for 27 years and my wife and I enjoy both ocean fishing and fresh water fishing at our Soda Springs mountain house.

My wife's parents live in Japan and schedule their visits in the summer, mainly so my father-in-law and I can fish. Though I can not speak Japanese and he not English, we have great time fishing and he takes many stories back

home. I'm not sure how I will break the news that their will not be a salmon season this year. He is 85 years young and it is tough to tell him that a sport he thoroughly enjoys will not be possible this year.

I hope the Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) will support MLPA Proposal 2-XA as it is a practical compromise to a tough set of choices and one that has the support of fishermen. I can tell you that it will keep the fires burning in at least two old ocean fishermen.

Sincerely,

John F. Berry

From: Nita Wells [mailto:wellsfarms@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 12:35 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for Proposal 2XA

To Whom It May Concern:

Please do not take away the owners rights to their own property to use and fish the natural waters of the ocean. Humans are part of the food chain as God intended, and are therefore the best guardians of their resources.

Spend the 24. million that this project will cost the taxpayers on **policing** the existing **public** area's that are being sorely abused due to the lack of police power. Quit taking away our rights, and start protecting them. As it's too late to correct this MLPA action altogether, at least preserve the owners rights with your support of Proposal 2XA.

Very Sincerely,

David Wells

From: Nita Wells [mailto:dnwells@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 12:02 AM
To: MLPAComments; fgc@fgc.ca.gov
Subject: Support for Proposal 2XA

To Whom It May Concern:

I was born in 1960 and I think I spent my greatest times with my parents fishing and picking abalone. There were many life lessons learned during those endless hours on the shoreline, not the least of which was how to be a preservationist and a sportsman both at the same time. I learned about the food chain, and how when we mess with it's natural order by adding or taking away one of it's components how you can really mess up the entire ecosystem. What we also learned is that *man* is an important part of that food chain.

I also remember how much better it was on the Richardson's ranch near Stuarts Point. They were natural preservationists...and it was a real treat to be invited onto their lands. Fishing from their rocks, or picking abalone on their shoreline was always a guarantee that you would get your limit as their waters are teaming with life.

The reason it was so good was that so few people were allowed by the landowners to fish and pick abalone on their property, hence a natural marine sanctuary, without taking away the property owners rights, or costing me money!

Restricting shoreline fishing in any way makes no sense....this messes with the food chain. What is needed is more active control over poachers and people who don't obey the regulations. Control over night fishing and people who use boats to illegally commercial fish near the shorelines pretending to fish for bottom fish, while using tank divers to stick huge amounts of abalone and urchins in hidden places for removal later. Just one of these boats can do more damage than a lifetime of fishing private property.

The private owners take very little from the ocean resources, pay large property tax bills, and spend their own money to prevent or reduce damage caused by the public. Restricting them on their own property would deprive them of valuable property rights they have enjoyed, and paid taxes on, for a very long time.

Landowners like the Richardsons, Pedrettis, Leporis, Ratcliffs, and others are operating their own marine sanctuaries. Their families and friends don't take enough fish and abalone to impact anything, unlike the aforementioned boats. Landowners constantly repair fences damaged by trespassers, patrol their properties to chase away poachers, and were far more effective, with no cost to taxpayers, than an army of game wardens.

If you should go through with this plan, you will severely impact the values of these property owners, and spend millions of tax payer dollars fighting a battle in court...that should never have started. This is not the way to protect marine life.

Please support these landowners, our marine wildlife and our rights to harvest it by supporting Proposal 2XA.

Very Sincerely, and Very Sad,

Nita K. Wells